Amendment Attorney Docket No. S63.2H-9503-US01

Remarks

The specification has been amended to recite the proper chain of priority. US Patent Application Serial No. 09/426384, from which the present application claims the benefit, which further claims the benefit of US Patent Application Serial No. 09/257,677, now US Patent No. 6,284,333. No new matter has been added. For applications filed prior to November, 2000, this can be accomplished by amendment. See MPEP 201.11(E).

A telephone interview was conducted with Examiner Sow-Fun Hon on December 14, 2004. This amendment and response has been prepared in accordance with that telephone interview.

Amendments have been made and claims canceled as suggested in the Advisory Action mailed December 22, 2004. Applicants reserve the right to prosecute any of the canceled claims in a continuation application.

The remaining claims have been found as being allowable over the art of record.

New Rejections

35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Rau et al.

Claims 1-2, 12-14, 19, 24, 31, 33 and 36 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rau et al. (WO 95/18647).

Independent claim 1 has been canceled and a new independent claim 37 has been added per the teleconference of December 14, 2004 with Examiner Sow-Fun Hon. Claim 31 has been amended in accordance with the teleconference as well.

Claims 2, 12-14, 31, 33 and 36 have been canceled without prejudice.

Claims 19 and 24 have been amended to depend from claim 37 and are patentable for at least the reasons that claim 37 is patentable.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection over Rau et al. (WO 95/18647) and reconsideration of the claims as presented.

Amendment Attorney Docket No. S63.2H-9503-US01

Rau et al. in view of Zdrahala

Claims 3-8 and 25-26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rau as applied to claims 1-2, 12-14, 19, 24, 31, 33 and 36 above, and further in view of Zdrahala (US 5,248,305).

Claims 3-8 and 26 have been amended to depend from claim 37 which has been added per the teleconference of December 13, 2004. Claim 25 has been canceled. Claims 3-8 and 26 are patentable for at least the reasons that claim 37 is patentable.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3-8 and 25-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rau as applied to claims 1-2, 12-14, 19, 24, 31, 33 and 36 above, and further in view of Zdrahala, (US 5,248,305).

Rau et al. in view of Zdrahala as evidenced by Yang (Polymer Data Handbook)

Claims 15-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rau et al. as applied to claims 1-2, 12-14, 19, 24, 31, 33 and 36, above, and further in view of Zdrahala (US 5,248,305) as evidenced by Yang (Polymer Data Handbook).

Claims 15-18 have been amended to depend from claim 37 and are patentable for at least the reasons that claim 37 is patentable.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 15-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rau et al. as applied to claims 1-2, 12-14, 19, 24, 31, 33 and 36, above, and further in view of Zdrahala (US 5,248,305) as evidenced by Yang (Polymer Data Handbook).

Rau et al. in view of Zdrahala as evidenced by Polymers (A Property Database)

Claims 20 and 22-23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rau et al. as applied to claims 1-2, 12-14, 19, 24, 31, 33 and 36, above, and further in view of Zdrahala (US 5,248,305) as evidenced by <u>Polymers</u> (A Property Database).

Claims 20 and 22-23 have been amended to depend from claim 37 and are patentable for at least the reasons that claim 37 is patentable.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 20 and 22-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rau et al. as applied to claims 1-2, 12-14,

Amendment
Attorney Docket No. S63.2H-9503-US01

19, 24, 31, 33 and 36, above, and further in view of Zdrahala (US 5,248,305) as evidenced by Polymers (A Property Database).

Rau et al. in view of Zdrahala as evidenced by Alger (Polymer Science Dictionary)

Claim 21 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rau et al. as applied to claims 1-2, 12-14, 19, 24, 31, 33 and 36, above, and further in view of Zdrahala (US 5,248,305) as evidenced by Alger (Polymer Science Dictionary).

Claim 21 has been canceled without prejudice. Applicant reserves the right to prosecute claim 21 in a continuation application.

Rau et al. in view of Heino et al.

Claims 8-11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rau et al. as applied to claims 1-2, 12-14, 19, 24, 31, 33 and 36, above, and further in view of Heino et al. (US 6,221,962).

Claims 8-11 have been amended to depend from claim 37 which was added per the teleconference of December 14, 2004.

Claims 8-11 are patentable for at least the reasons that claim 37 is patentable.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 8-11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rau et al. as applied to claims 1-2, 12-14, 19, 24, 31, 33 and 36, above, and further in view of Heino et al. (US 6,221,962).

Amendment
Attorney Docket No. S63.2H-9503-US01

CONCLUSION

Claims 3-11, 15-20, 22, 23, 26 and 37 are pending in the application. Applicants have addressed each of the issues presented in the Office Action. Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and an early allowance of the claims as presented. Should any issues remain, the attorney of record may be reached at (952)563-3011, to expedite prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

VIDAS, ARRETT & STEINKRAUS

Date: January 5, 2005

Registration No : 43071

6109 Blue Circle Drive, Suite 2000 Minnetonka, MN 55343-9185 Telephone: (952) 563-3000

Facsimile: (952) 563-3001

f:\wpwork\lrl\09503us01_amd_20041026.doc